UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,829	12/29/2000	Shlomi Harif	AUS9000888US1	8494

35617	7590	05/28/2004

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
P.O. BOX 684908
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER
HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/751,829	HARIF, SHLOMI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Matthew T Henning	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _29 December 2000_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-62_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-62_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _03/20/2001_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail. Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/29/2000.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-62 have been examined.

Title

2.   The title of the invention is acceptable.

Priority

3.   The application has been filed under Title 35 U.S.C §119, claiming priority to Provisional application 60/230,107, filed September 5, 2000.

4.   The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is September 5, 2000.

Information Disclosure Statement

5.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on September 20, 2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Drawings

6.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Reference signs 42 and 44, as recited on page 18 Paragraph 2, are missing from Figure 2. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are

required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.

The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

7.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because

Lines 1-2: The title of the invention must be removed, as it is not a proper

heading for the Abstract of the Disclosure.

Line 2: The phrase "are described herein to provide" can be implied and

therefore must be removed.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claims

8.   The applicant is reminded that a series of singular dependent claims is

permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn,

refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated

by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should

be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent

claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP

§ 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly

pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant

regards as his invention.

10.   Claims 6, 16, and 57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

11.   Regarding claim 6, a broad range or limitation together with a narrow

range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same

claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth

the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation

given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10

USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language

is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this

can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the

feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of

the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims.

Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd.

App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*,

86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 6 recites the broad

recitation "a network", and the claim also recites "such as the Internet" which is

the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

For purposes of searching prior art, the examiner will assume that "such

as the Internet" was merely an example and was not meant to limit the claim.

12.   Regarding claim 16, the recitation of the limitation "the encoding device" in

line 1 lacks antecedent basis. Therefore, the claim scope of the claim is

rendered indeterminate. For purposes of searching prior art, the examiner will

assume the line was meant to read "an encoding device is adapted to".

13.   Regarding claim 57, the recitation of the limitation "the computer-usable

carrier medium" in line 1 lacks antecedent basis. Therefore, the claim scope of

the claim is rendered indeterminate. For purposes of searching art, the examiner

will assume that the claim is meant to refer to "the computer-readable medium" of

claim 56.

14.   Claim 39 rejected under Title 35 U.S.C. 112 fourth paragraph, for failing to

further limit the subject matter previously claimed. Claim 39 is exactly the same

as claim 27 and therefore fails to limit the subject matter previously claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this
or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than
one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

16.   Claims 1, 4-7, 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Schuermann (U.S. Patent 5,552,789) hereinafter referred to as Schuermann.

17.   Claim 1 recites a first computational device containing tags and

associated rules sets for controlling operational privileges. Schuermann

disclosed a controller (computational device) identifying transponders based on

the encoded data (tag) stored within each transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8

Paragraph 2) and using this information received from the transmitter to adjust

the operational parameters of the vehicle (See Schuermann Col. 8 Lines 4-11

and Lines 16-18). Schuermann also disclosed that these settings were

previously stored in the controller (See Schuermann Col. 8 Lines 64-67).

Claim 1 further recites a second computational device for programming an

access device with an identification tag after authorization from the first

computational device. Schuermann disclosed a writer, controlled by the

controller (See Schuermann Figure 1 Element 10), for writing to the transponders

(See Schuermann Col. 5 Lines 44-47). Because the data stored on the

transponder identifies the transponder to the controller (See Schuermann Col. 8

Paragraph 2) it is inherent that the data written to the transponder is used for

identification purposes and is therefore a tag.

18.   Claims 4 and 5 recite a third computational device for writing the tags to

the access device and for re-authenticating the access device upon authorization

from the first computational device. Schuermann disclosed an interrogator

controlled by the controller for reading from and writing to the transponder (See

Schuermann Col. 3 Paragraph 5). Because the data stored on the transponder

identifies the transponder to the controller (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 2)

it is inherent that the data written to the transponder is used for identification

purposes and is therefore a tag.

        Schuermann further disclosed the interrogator re-authenticating the

transponders on a regular basis (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 4).

Schuermann also disclosed that the interrogator may be satellite to the controller,

but still controlled by the controller (See Schuermann Claim 19).

19.   Regarding claim 6, because all of the elements of the system disclosed by

the combination of Schuermann communicated between each other, it was

inherent that some form of a network connected them.

20.   Claim 7 recites an encoding device for programming a tag into an access

device upon authorization from a central authority. Schuermann disclosed a

central authority (a controller) (See Schuermann Col. 2 Paragraph 4).

Schuermann further disclosed a writer, controlled by the controller (See

Schuermann Figure 1 Element 10), for writing to the transponders (See

Schuermann Col. 5 Lines 44-47). Because the data stored on the transponder

identifies the transponder to the controller (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 2)

it is inherent that the data written to the transponder is used for identification

purposes and is therefore a tag.

Because communications between the transponders and the controller

were via radio frequency communication links (See Schuermann Col. 3

Paragraph 2), it was inherent that an encoding device was provided to encode

the communications to the correct radio frequency prior to transmission. The

TIRIS reader/writer disclosed by Schuermann (See Schuermann Col. 5

Paragraph 5) showed this RF encoding.

21.   Claim 12 recites the network comprising the Internet. Schuermann

disclosed communicating with toll booths regarding credit authorization

information (See Schuermann Col. 7 Paragraphs 3-4) which constitutes the

Internet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary
> skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not
> be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23.   Claim 2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schuermann. Claim 2 recites the second computational device programming an

authentication device with the plurality of identification codes. Schuermann

disclosed multiple transponders and the ability to identify each (See Schuermann

Col. 8 Paragraph 2). Schuermann further disclosed the reader receiving

information from the transponders, verifying the identity of the transponder using

the received information, and then applying the corresponding initialization

parameters from previously stored data (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

In order for the reader to verify the identity of the transponder and its

corresponding parameters, it was necessary that the reader had access to the

access codes and parameters. Therefore, they must have been stored in the

reader.

Further, because the writer already had the task of writing the access

codes to the transponder, and the reader (authentication device) needed the

codes as well, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art

to have the writer program the codes into the reader as well. This would have

been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been

motivated to use the writer for all necessary writing as opposed to having multiple

writers. Schuermann hinted at the idea of only having a single reader and writer

by supplying a multiplexer for communicating with the transponders (See

Schuermann Figure 1 Element 12).

24.   Claim 3 recites the access device and the authentication device

interfacing in order to provide the operational privileges if the access device

provides a recognized tag. (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

25.   Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 2, wherein the second

computational device of claim 2 is the encoder of claim 8, disclosed by

Schuermann as a TIRIS reader applied to claim 7 above.

26.   Claim 9 rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 wherein the central

authority of claim 9 is the first computational device of claim 1, disclosed by

Schuermann as the controller applied to claim 7 above.

27.   Claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1.

28.   Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 3, wherein a

communications link is established between the access device and the

authentication device (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

29.   Claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 7, 8 and 10 above.

30.   Claim 14 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.

31.   Claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7 above.

32.   Claim 16 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.

33.   Claim 17 rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.

34.   Claim 18 rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above.

35.   Claims 19 and 20 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 7 and 8

above.

36.   Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above.

37.   Claim 22 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 9 and 10 above.

38.   Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.

39.   Regarding claim 24, Schuermann disclosed the TIRIS reader/writer re-authenticating the transponders on a regular basis, including the access device (Element 22) (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 4).

40.   Claims 25 and 28 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 7 and 8 above, and further because Schuermann clearly depicted the TIRIS reader and controller in a vehicle (See Figures 1 and 2 Element 10).

41.   Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 9 and 10 above.

42.   Claims 27 and 39 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above.

43.   Claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 above.

44.   Regarding claim 30, Schuermann disclosed the TIRIS reader causing the initialization of the ignition, an engine control module (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

45.   Regarding claim 31, Schuermann clearly depicted the TIRIS reader coupled to a processor for controlling the vehicle settings and ignition initialization (See Schuermann Figure 1 Elements 10, 33, and 34b, and Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

46.   Regarding claim 32, Schuermann disclosed that the vehicle performance and maximum speed (operational parameters) were associated with the key transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 1). Schuermann also disclosed that the key transmitted access codes to the reader, which the reader verified, and then the settings were initialized (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5). Schuermann further disclosed that the Reader and key communicated via RF

transmissions, which falls within the scope of telematics (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5).

47.   Claim 33 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24 above.

48.   Regarding claim 34, Schuermann disclosed storing toll credit limits and charge deduction and billing information from a parking toll station (See Schuermann Col. 9 Paragraph 7).

49.   Regarding claim 35, Schuermann disclosed that the controller identified each transponder by the data stored on each (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 2). Therefore, the controller must have used the data stored in the transponder, as discussed for claim 34 above, for identification purposes. Schuermann further disclosed that the controller interrogated the transponders (See Schuermann Col 9 Paragraph 6) and that the TIRIS reader was used for communications between the transponders and the controller (See Schuermann Col. 3 Paragraph 3). It is therefore inherent that the TIRIS reader must have retrieved the data from the transponder and then submitted it to the interrogating controller.

50.   Claim 36 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 24 and further due to the obvious nature of the claim. That is, it would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to not allow re-authentication if the rule set did not allow re-authentication and to allow it if the rule set allowed it. This would have been obvious because the ordinary person skilled in the art would have been motivated to follow the rules of each rule set.

51.   Claim 40 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 7, 9, and 10 above and further because it is inherent that the data encoded in the transponders and the settings associated with them were established before the controller as could use them as disclosed by Schuermann (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraphs 1-2).

52.   Claim 41 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 8 above.

53.   Regarding claim 42, Schuermann disclosed an RF communication link between the controller and the transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 3). Schuermann further disclosed establishing such a link, retrieving the access codes from the transponder (identification tag), verifying the codes, and applying previously stored pre-set requirements (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5). It was inherent that the pre-set requirements were retrieved in order to apply them. Schuermann further disclosed that the vehicle performance limitations and the vehicle adjustments are uniquely associated with the key transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 1).

54.   Regarding claim 43, Schuermann disclosed that until a proper identification code is provided, the engine would not start (See Schuermann Col. 7 Paragraph 1). This falls within the scope of default operation privileges.

55.   Regarding claim 47, Schuermann disclosed a central authority in a vehicle (a controller) and also disclosed communications between the transponders and the controller (See Schuermann Col. 3 Paragraph 2). Schuermann also disclosed encoded data being stored in the transponders (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 2). Because communications between the transponders and the

controller were via radio frequency communication links (See Schuermann Col. 3

Paragraph 2), it was inherent that the transponders contained an encoding

device to encode the communications to the correct radio frequency. It was also

inherent that a communications link was established between the controller and

the RF encoder in order for the controller to have communicated with the

transponders. As shown for claims 9 and 10, the controller administered tags

that were associated with rule sets corresponding to user operational privileges.

Schuermann further disclosed the transponder sending its identification

codes (request for authentication) to the TIRIS reader controller and the

controller receiving and verifying the codes (determining authorization) (See

Schuermann Col 8. Paragraph 5 and Element 10).

56.   Claims 48 and 49 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 34, 35, and

36 above, and further because Schuermann disclosed the controller verifying the

access codes received from the encoder of the transponder (See Schuermann

Col 8. Paragraph 5).

57.   Claim 50 is rejected for the same reason as claim 47, wherein the access

device of claim 47 is the slave access device of claim 50.

58.   Claim 58 recites program instructions executable on a first computational

device for authenticating an encoding device coupled to the central authority.

Schuermann disclosed the controller verifying the access codes received from

the encoder of the transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5). It was

inherent that the controller had the necessary program instructions to carry out

this functionality.

Claim 58 further recites second program instructions authorizing a request

sent via the network authenticating a first access device, which contains an

identification tag associated with operational privileges of the user. Schuermann

disclosed the TIRIS reader/writer re-authenticating the transponders on a regular

basis, including the access device (Element 22) (See Schuermann Col. 8

Paragraph 4). Schuermann further disclosed the transponder sending its

identification codes (request for authentication) to the TIRIS reader controller and

the controller receiving and verifying the codes (determining authorization) (See

Schuermann Col 8. Paragraph 5 and Element 10). Schuermann also disclosed

transponder (Element 22) containing programmed tags, as discussed for claim 1

above. It was inherent that the controller had the necessary program instructions

to carry out this functionality.

59.   Claim 59 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 34 and 35 above. It

was inherent that the controller had the necessary program instructions to carry

out this functionality.

60.   Claim 60 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above. It was

inherent that the controller had the necessary program instructions to carry out

this functionality.

61.   Claim 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Schuermann as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Treharne et al

(U.S. Patent Number 5,416,471) hereinafter referred to as Treharne.

Schuermann disclosed that until a proper identification code is provided,

the engine would not start (See Schuermann Col. 7 Paragraph 1). However,

Schuermann failed to disclose a method for bypassing the operational privileges

of a key. Schuermann also failed to disclose a method for programming new

keys for access to the system.

Treharne teaches that a spare vehicle key can be programmed into a

security system by using a known key to provide authorization to program a new

key (See Treharne Abstract). Treharne shows the steps of programming the new

key into the system in Figure 3. The steps include authenticating a first key (See

Figure 3 Step 54), inserting the new, un-programmed, key (See Figure 3 Step

60), reading the information on the new key (See Figure 3 Step 62), and then

programming the new key into the system (See Figure 3 Step 66), at which point

the key is able to open the lock.

It would have been obvious to the ordinary person skilled in the art to

employ the teachings of Treharne in the invention of Schuermann in order to

program new keys for authorization in the system. This would have been

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

provide the vehicle owners with a simple method for granting new users, such as

first time drivers, with access and operational privileges.

62.   Claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1 as applied to claim

37 above. Because the tag was written to the transponder, and the controller

identified the transponder by this tag, it was inherent that the new tag granting

privileges replaced the old tag on the transponder. Therefore, access to the old

tag was disabled.

63.   Claim 44 and 46 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 37 and 38 above.

64.   Regarding claim 45, Schuermann disclosed the operational limitations being enabled according to the capabilities of the key holder. It was inherent that the combination of Schuermann and Treharne be able to provide a new user with full operational privileges if the holder of the new key did not require limitations.

65.   Claim 51 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 37 and 48 above.

66.   Claim 52 recites program instructions executable on a first computational device for authenticating an encoding device coupled to the central authority. Schuermann disclosed the controller verifying the access codes received from the encoder of the transponder (See Schuermann Col. 8 Paragraph 5). It was inherent that the controller had the necessary program instructions to carry out this functionality.

Claim 52 further recites second program instructions for authorizing a request sent via the network from the encoding device for programming the access device with one of the tags. Treharne disclosed the request for programming the new key, authorizing the request, and programming the new key as a valid entry key (See Treharne Col. 3 Paragraph 1). Because the request is made by an attempt to use the new transponder, it was inherent that the new transponder sent the request through its RF encoder. It was also inherent that the controller of Schuermann was provided the necessary program instructions to enable this functionality.

67.   Claim 53 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 7, 8, and 9, and further because it was inherent that the controller of Schuermann was provided the necessary program instructions to enable this functionality.

68.   Claim 54 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11 and further because it was inherent that the TIRIS reader of Schuermann was provided the necessary program instructions to enable this functionality.

69.   Claim 55 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 43 above, and further because it was inherent that the reader of Schuermann was provided the necessary program instructions to enable this functionality.

70.   Claims 56 and 57 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 37 and 38, and further because it was inherent that the controller and reader of Schuermann were provided the necessary program instructions to enable this functionality.

71.   Claims 61 and 62 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 37 above, and further because the valid key (See Treharne Figure 3 Step 54) falls within the scope of a master to the new key, wherein the new key is the is the first access device of claim 58 above.

Conclusion

72.   Claims 1-62 have been rejected.

73.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

a.   Schuermann et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,552,789) disclosed a

transponder comprising an interrogator for reading and writing to the

transponder via RF communications.

b.   Moseley (U.S. Patent Number 5,193,114) disclosed a method for

authenticating a smart card and encrypting the communications with the

smart card.

c.   Beigel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,257,011) disclosed a method

for altering the data of a transponder.

d.   Boyles (U.S. Patent Number 5,323,140) disclosed a method for

bypassing an anti-theft system in a vehicle involving a button and an

ignition key.

e.   Drexler et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,457,747) disclosed a method

for authorizing smart card usage in order to gain privileges.

f.   Murphy (U.S. Patent Number 5,712,625) disclosed a method of

adaptation to a user by identification key transmitter.

g.   Brinkmeyer et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,708,712) disclosed an

electronic key for storing an identification code, which has been encrypted

on the basis of a one-way function.

h.   Deo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,721,781) disclosed a smart card

authentication system involving certificates.

i.   Ohashi et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,761,309) disclosed a smart

card authentication method involving both master and slave authentication

centers.

j.   Brinkmeyer et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,774,550) disclosed a

method of authorization and synchronization of a smart card.

k.   Lenart et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,880,679) disclosed a method of

enabling a vehicle from a remote location.

74.   Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Matthew

Henning whose telephone number is (703) 305-0713. The examiner can

normally be reached Monday-Friday from 9am to 4pm, EST.

If attempts to reach examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's acting supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (703) 305-9648.

The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-3718.

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone

number is (703) 305-3900.

Matthew Henning
Assistant Examiner
Art Unit 2131

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100